

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-119 are currently pending. Claims 1, 19, 27, 38, 61, 83, 101, and 109 have been amended by the present amendment. The changes to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,202,092 to Takimoto (hereinafter “the ‘092 patent”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2001/0034747 to Fujitani et al. (hereinafter “the ‘747 application”).

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a printing system, comprising: (1) a printing apparatus; (2) a terminal apparatus for transmitting information including a request to execute the print job and for receiving information; (3) notification means for notifying a registered user of the printing apparatus of information on authority of the registered user to use the printing apparatus prior to transmission of the request to execute the print job to be printed by the printing apparatus, but after the registered user has established access to use of the printing apparatus; and (4) a network connecting the printing apparatus, the terminal apparatus, and the notification means so that information transmission and reception in the system is performed through an electrical signal via the network. The changes to Claim 1 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter. See, e.g., Figure 4 and the discussion related thereto in the specification.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office Action asserts that the ‘092 patent discloses everything in Claim 1 with the exception of “notifying a

user prior to the transmission of the request to execute the print job to be printed by the printing apparatus,”¹ and relies on the ‘747 application to remedy that deficiency.

The ‘092 patent is directed to a print system including a shared printer on a network in which the authority of each user to use the printer is set in a security database. After a print request, including the number of sheets to be printed, is sent to a security validating device, the ‘092 patent discloses that the security validating device decides whether authorization to use the printer is to be granted based on the restrictions on the user maintained in the database and the status of the user. Further, the ‘092 patent discloses that, if the printing is authorized, the printing is completed and the status of the user is updated in the security database. However, as admitted in the Office Action, the ‘092 patent fails to disclose notification means for notifying a user of the printing apparatus of information on authority of the registered user to use the printing apparatus prior to the transmission of the request to execute the print job to be printed by the printing apparatus, as recited in Claim 1.

The ‘747 application is directed to printer processing stations for printing information stored on portable digital devices such as cell phones. The ‘747 application discloses that a user is able to connect to the processing station, select a method of payment, and enter an ID and password before the printing is approved. See Figures 8-10 of the ‘747 application. In particular, the ‘747 application discloses that, depending on the selected payment method, it may be necessary to identify the user via a validation code or pin number.² However, Applicant respectfully submits that the ‘747 application fails to disclose notification means for notifying a registered user of the printing apparatus of information on authority of the registered user to use the printing apparatus prior to the transmission of the request to execute the print job to be printed by the printing apparatus, but after the registered user has established access to use of the printing apparatus. Rather, the security measures disclosed

¹ See page 4 of the outstanding Office Action.

² See paragraph 44 of the ‘747 application.

by the '747 application are used to facilitate the *registration* of a user to print a requested document. See '747 Figure 9, which indicates that, once the password has been accepted, the printing proceeds as requested in step S4. The '747 application merely discloses that security procedures, including those involving payment, are implemented prior to printing. However, the '747 patent application does not teach or suggest that after the user has registered and established access to the printing device, that the user is notified of information on authority of the registered user to use the printing apparatus prior to transmission of a request to execute the print job, as required by amended Claim 1.

Thus, no matter how the teachings of the '092 patent and the '747 application are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest the notification means recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 1 (and all similarly rejected dependent claims) is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 1.

In the outstanding Office Action, the stated motivation for combining the teachings of the '092 patent and the '747 application is "to check a permission prior to submitting job information."³ However, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action is merely stating perceived advantages of Applicant's invention as motivation to combine the cited references, without identifying that, without Applicant's specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would have even thought to address the problem. The Office Action has failed to identify why "checking a permission prior to submitting job information" is an advantage that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize from the teachings of the '747 application and the '092 patent.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no technological motivation to combine the teachings of the '092 patent and the '747 application in the manner suggested in

³ See page 4 of the outstanding Office Action.

the outstanding Office Action. The '092 patent discloses performing a security validation after a print request is received. The Office Action has failed to identify what problems exist with such a system and why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the '092 system. What problem would one of ordinary skill in the art be addressing by modifying the '092 patent? Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 1 (and all similarly rejected dependent claims) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claims 19, 27, 38, 61, 83, 101, and 109 recite limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 1. Moreover, Claims 19, 27, 38, 61, 83, 101, and 109 have been amended in a manner analogous to the amendments to Claim 1. Accordingly, reasons analogous to the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits the rejections of the independent claims are rendered moot by the present amendment to those claims.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 19, 27, 38, 61, 83, 101, and 109 patentably define over any proper combination of the '092 patent and the '747 application.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461

I:\ATTY\KMB\217727US-AM.DOC